DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 150 EA 019 877

AUTHOR Marshall, Catherine
TITLE Using Sociolinguistics for Exploring Gender and Culture Issues in Educational Administration.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Reseach Association Special Interest Group, Research on Women in Education (Portland, OR, November 12-14, 1987).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Qualifications; *Anthropological Linguistics; Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Employed Women; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Interpersonal Competence; *Language Skills; Research Needs; *Sex Differences; Sex Discrimination
IDENTIFIERS *Microanalysis; *Organizational Culture

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the role of language in understanding the inequality of male and female access to positions in educational administration. By applying techniques of sociolinguistics, the paper seeks to demonstrate the potential of the microanalysis of language for identifying the assumptions, norms, and values in the culture of school administration. As gender issue questions arose, studies revealed that more women than men designate education as their first career choice, that women attain administrative positions later in life than men, and that men achieve higher salary levels than their female counterparts. Recent research shows that the requirements of a male-oriented career have made women appear less competent and feel less comfortable with entry administration. If such positions are available to women, the superintendency is not one of them. Sociolinguistic research can serve as a new tool for analyzing the contributions in language differences among men and women, as well as demonstrating that women administrators offer a source of insight into the administrative culture. A range of research agendas using linguistic analysis would reveal particular norms and patterns for the empirical grounding of a serious critique that would expand leadership theory to incorporate the values and experiences of women. Such reformulation of the administrative culture should originate from the voices of women. Sixty-one references are appended. (CJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED291150

USING SOCIOLINGUISTICS FOR EXPLORING GENDER AND CULTURE ISSUES IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Catherine Marshall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at
the American Educational Research Association,
Conference of the Special Interest Group:
Research on Women in Education,
Portland, Oregon, November 12-14, 1987

EA019877

November, 1987

Catherine Marshall
Associate Professor
Box 514 Peabody College
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Using Sociolinguistics for Exploring Gender and Culture Issues in Educational Administration

Listen for the differences in the words of two imaginary school suprintendents at work:

"We've got to close Beacon Elementary next year."

"I think we need to have some sort of discussion about closing Beacon, don't you?"

Which evokes the competence, control, and self-confidence of a powerful school administrator? Which speaker is most likely male? What sounds "wrong" with the second quotation? Which speaker stands the better chance of receiving a contract from the school board?

This paper focuses on the role of language in understanding the inequality of male and female access to administrative positions, and demonstrates the potential of the microanalysis of language for identifying the assumptions, norms, values, and priorities in the culture of school administration. It traces the evolution of gender issue questions in educational administration, poses questions about the administrative culture that the study of gender elicits, and underscores the promise of anthropological microanalytic techniques for answering these new culture questions.

The Old Questions About Women

Early research on gender in school administration asked, "are women compentent as administrators?" and the answer was "yes." Women are competent, are becoming credentialed for administrative positions, and also, according to recent research, demonstrate gender-related qualities that strenghten their performance in administrative roles. An abundance of literature testifies that women administrators pay more attention to teachers' development, to the instructional program, and to being instructional leaders who assist struggling teachers (Berman, 1982; Pitner, 1981; Gross and Trask, 1976).

Another early question was "where are the women?" Women have consistently represented more than 80% of the elementary and 46% of the secondary school teachers. While they once occupied 62% of elementary principalships, this has declined to 17%. They once held 6% of secondary principalships but now hold only 3.5%. Women serve in 3% of the U.S. school district superintendencies, which represents a slight rise. Further, when women do enter administration, they are far more likely to be in staff rather than line positions; advisors rather than decisionmakers (Ortiz, 1982).

Researchers also asked, "how do women and men differ in terms of characteristics, background, and career paths?" Shakeshaft (1987) summarized the differences between women and men in administration, indicating that more women than men designate education as their first career choice, experience career interruptions (usually for maternity and child care leaves), represent a higher proportion of minority principals, come from urban backgrounds, and tend to be politically liberal. Men, on the other hand, move into educational administration graduate study more quickly and more often, are more likely to have sponsors for entry into administrative positions, are more often married, and attain higher salary levels than their female counterparts. Other research reports that women attain administrative positions later in life than do men (Haven, Adkinson, and Bagley, 1980; Pharis and Zachariya, 1979).

These early studies spawned the research on sex discrimination. Such research showed how school organizations excluded women from administrative promotions by maintaining job descriptions that require within-district administration experience in districts with no women administrators (Timpano and Knight, 1976). Various researchers have found resentment and hostility towards female leaders (Kahn, 1984) and general uneasiness about working for female principals and superintendents (Williams and Willower, 1983; Fishel and Pottker, 1977).

Research framed by socialization theory, conjoined with the research on discrimination, revealed how the requirements of a male-normed career effectively made women appear less competent and feel less comfortable with entry administration. Embarking upon a serious administrative career path requires of women a transition socialization process. They must create an image of competency despite the traditional career norms that call for large build, deep voice, expertise in building maintenance, and sports, and Rotary membership. They must also create a support system that will enable them to contend with the expectation that women are to concern themselves primarily with their families, children and instruction, and eshew power, politics, and tough decisions (Marshall, 1979).

Women's career paths seldom lead to administrative positions. The assistant principalship, often the entry level position into administration (Austin & Brown, 1970), is also seen as a disciplinarian position not suited for women. Positions such as the elementary principalship or central office staff which <u>are</u> accessible to women, do not lead to the superintendency (Gaertner, 1981). The most direct path to the superintendency--assistant secondary principal, secondary principal, assistant/associate superintendent, superintendent--is seldom followed by women (Gaertner, 1987). Women are more likely to move from assistant elementary principal to principal to retirement,or from specialist to administrator of instruction or supervisor to retirement (Gaertner, 1981; Otriz, 1982).

What do we do? Do we attempt to "fix" women (refashion them with traditionally masculine qualities) or do we "fix" organizations (establish affirmative action procedures)? Since neither of thses quick fixes has eliminated the problem of women's exclusion from administrative careers, perhaps the most appropriate course is to reformat the question.

The New Question: What Does the Focus on Women tell About the Culture of Administration?

Assuming that women educators are competent and that their styles, abilities, and values represent untapped resources, how do we identify those resources, inquire into our deficiency in tapping them, and discover how to benefit from these resources. What is there about the administrative culture that discourages them? What in the administrative culture does not fit for women? Do women administrators speak, act, prioritize, and choose differently? Most importantly, if women's values differ and women's behavior and expectations conflict with the administrative culture, how can administration learn from the perspectives of women? Instead of changing women, the field of educational administration should invest its energies listening to women's voices as a source of insight into the administration culture and as a mode of self-critique.

A New Method of Analysis: Focus on Language

Sociolinguistic research Philips (1980) can serve as a new tool for analyzing whether the language differences of male and female administrators contribute to male dominance in educational administration. The language of administrators can be a vital key to understanding cultural norms, values, and attitudes. Analysis of patterns in the language of male and female administrators will provide new microanalytic approach to understanding the different experiences and opportunities for men and women.

Research on Language in Administration

Verbal interactions (phone conversations and short, impromptu meetings in offices and corridors) make up the bulk of school administrator's work (Kmetz and Willower, 1982; Wolcott, 1973; Berman, 1982; and Mintzberg, 1973). In addition, administrators manage (through talk) the symbols, ceremonies, and rituals that maintain the commonality of meaning that keeps people believing in the organization (Pfeffer, 1981; Meyer and Rowan, 1977).

Emerging theory of leadership suggests that leadership is a "language game" (Pondy, 1978, p. 95) wherein leaders make sense of things and create, with words, a common sense of purpose and an image that causes people to care and to commit themselves to accomplishing organizational goals. Sociolinguistic research shows women's language to be more inclusive, more likely to elicit the ideas and feelings of others. More research is needed to understand the content and function of language as used by educational leaders. To what extent is the language expressive of themes of empowerment (as opposed to hierarchical control), themes of inclusion and participation (as opposed to maintenance of boundaries between schools and community, teachers and administration, etc), themes of instruction and learning (as opposed to politics and power), or themes of equity (as opposed to the sorting and filtering function of schooling)?

Few researchers have closely examined the talk of administrators. Pitner's (1981) study showed female superintendents' contacts to be more informal and more likely to be with professional peers and female counterparts. The men used lunchtime to gain visability, exposure, and to establish connections with community leaders. Women used their free time for sponsoring and networking, as might be expected from a minority group. Men were aggressively building broader individual political contacts. Pitner documents gender differences between the language used by men and that used by women.

Mitchell's (1987) field study included an analysis of the language and the stated and enacted philosophy of male and female assistant principals. Using Gilligan's (1982) framework for analysing evidence of a theoretically female connection orientation (an attachment, caring ethos) or a theoretically male detachment orientation (a justice and equality ethos, Mitchell found that both women and men could have either orientation. Men, however, were more likely to have a detatchment orientation, and women were more likely to have the connection orientation. She also found that a majority of those moving to higher administrative positions evidenced with a middle ground orientation.

They could apply "stick to the rules" attitudes but could also be sensitive to the context, bend the rules at times, and seek to solve problems situationally.

Shadowing an elementary school principal during a two-day period, Gronn (1983) discovered that his subject used "talk" to maintain control. Gronn felt "talk" was used to make known the principal's version of something and was to influence others. It was used, in effect, to cloak power. Gronn also found that the size and architectural arrangement of the territory in which the principal engaged in "talk" appeared crucial. Long, narrow corridors provided an advantageous forum for the principal to engage in political niceties such as greeting, smiling, nodding, and mingling while talking. The background noise of the corridors worked to the advantage of maintaining privacy in communications. Gronn noted a change in the power status of "talk" when the conversation moved to the principal's office.

Studies of educational leaders' language and interaction patterns show the potential of analysing and critiquing the culture of administration through language. The next section reviews the extensive sociolinguistic literature to understand and critique the findings, the controversies, and the methodologies. From this review, we then proceed propose research agendas for studying the administrative culture.

Sociolinguistic Research on Gender Differences

A review of sociolinguistic research[1] reveals:

1. differences in the way males and females communicate;
2. conflicting interpretations of these differences;
3. perceptions and expectations of gender-related language differences;
4. preferences, under certain circumstances,for female language;
5. perceptions of female language as an official, elite language; and

[1] This review is limited in that it does not include the extensive literature (e.g. Kramer, 1975) on tonal, phonological, and semantic aspects.

6. limitations of study done to determine the nature of language used by women achieving power status, or of language women should use.

While the work of Lakoff (1975) has provided controversy and spawned other empirical studies (Spender, 1980; Coates, 1986), it provides the most specific descriptions of differences between male and female language patterns. Women's language is characterized by:

1. empty adjectives ("adorable", "charming", "divine,") and mild expletives ("oh dear");
2. tag questions connoting uncertainty; ("I think we need to have some sort of discussion about closing Beacon, don't you?")
3. rising intonation when making statements, indicating uncertainty and subordination (Q: When will dinner be ready? A: "Oh, at around 6 o'clock?");
4. hedges, ("kinda, "I guess," "I think," "I wonder") used to soften direct questions);
5. use of "so" rather than a stronger superlative ("He's so helpful" as opposed to ("He's very helpful");
6. hypercorrect grammer (completing "ing" endings, while boys say "singin'," "goin'," etc.);
7. superpolite forms ("please" and "thank you"), use of euphemism, and general avoidance of strong statements;
8. no sense of humor (which may be avoidance of sexist humor);

Interruptions and overlaps. Studies of conversation interruptions and overlaps are used to understand conversation dominance. In Zimmerman and West's (1975) study, all of the overlaps were caused by the male speakers, and forty-six of the forty-eight interruptions were cases of the man interrupting the woman. Men rarely interrupt one another; it is when they are talking to women that they use interruptions. The research indicates that in a mixed-sex conversation men infringe women's right to speak, specifically women's right to

finish a turn. Conversely, the fact that women used no overlaps in conversation with men (while they did use some in same-sex conversations) suggests that women are concerned **not** to violate the man's turn but to wait until he's finished. Speakers tend to fall silent after interruptions and overlaps. The speaker who falls silent is usually a woman.

When talking with women, men use interruptions and delay minimal responses, denying women the right to control the topic of conversation--normally shared equally in a conversation. Leet-Pellegrini (1980) found that male speakers who were well-informed dominated conversation because they used a style of interaction based on power (asserting an unequal right to talk and to control topics) while well-informed female speakers preferred an interactional style (based on solidarity and support).

Hedging. Researchers (Strodback and Mann, 1956; Hirshmann, 1974; Fishman, 1980; and Zimmerman and West, 1975) show that women more often use hedging expressions such as "sort of" and "you know," thus making declarations less assertive. Fishman (1980) taped the daily conversation of three young American couples (a total of fifty-two hours of speech) and found that the women used "you know" five times more than the men. Coates (1986) explained that in interactional terms, "you know" is an attention-getting device. The speaker checks that the addressee is listening and comprehending, or invites the addressee to respond by signaling the potential end of a turn.

Verbosity. Women's alleged verbosity is not supported by research. Men have been shown to talk more than women in settings ranging from staff meetings (Eakins & Eakins 1978) to television panel discussions (Bernard 1972). Coates (1986) explained, "we have different expectations of male and female speakers: while men have the right to talk, women are expected to remain silent - talking at any length, then, will be perceived as talkativeness in women" (p. 103).

Coates continued: "the word chatter, which is nearly always used of women rather than men, has two main sematic components: verbosity and triviality.

The idea that women discuss topics which are essentially trivial has probably contributed to the myth of women's verbosity, since talk on trivial topics can more easily be labelled 'too much.' The evidence is that women and men do tend to discuss different topics (see Aries 1976; Haas 1979; Stone 1983), as do girls and boys. However, the fact that topics such as sport, politics, cars are seen as 'serious' while topics such as child-rearing and personal relationships are labelled 'trivial' is simply a reflection of social values which define what men do as important, and conversely what women do as less important" (p. 103).

Tag questions. Recent research shows that both women and men use tag questions. The important question is what tag questions are used for (Duboise and Crouch, 1975). Holmes (1984) found the women and men do not differ greatly in total usage of tags. Using the term facilitator to refer to those responsible for ensuring that interaction proceeds smoothly (interviewers on radio and television, discussion group leaders, teachers, hosts). Holmes notes that 59% of the tags used by women were facilitative (compared with 25% for men), while 61% of the tags used by men were modal, expressing uncertainty (compared with 35% for women). When the relationship between the participants is taken into account, it emerges that facilitators are more likely to use tags than non-facilitators.

Analysis of women's question-asking shows that women do ask more general questions than men. Fishman (1980) explains women's question-asking by examining the interaction. In interactive terms, questions are stronger than statements since they give the speaker the power to elicit a response. Speaker A can use the tag "didn't she?" to nudge B into an active role. Research findings so far suggest that women use interrogative forms more than men and that this may reflect women's relative weakness in interactive situations: they exploit questions and tag questions as a power-building device in order to keep conversation going.

Commands. Research shows that boys and girls use of commands and directives differ. Girls command people by say "let's go play" or "we could go play" whereas boys are more likely to give a direct command like "we're gonna play." Girls commands are less direct but more inclusive, indicating to others that they have a say in the action.

Swearing. There is much folklore but little hard evidence on male/female differences in swearing. The male speakers in Gomm's (1981) research did swear more often than the female speakers. Both women and men swore more in the company of their own sex; male usage of swear words in particular dropped dramatically in mixed sex conversations.

Politeness. Researchers have gone beyond Lakoff's (1975) assertion that women are more polite than men. Brown (1980) argues that linguistic markers of politeness are a good indication of social relationships. The level f politeness depends upon the social relationships of those interacting. Brown found that women use hedges such as "maybe," "perhaps," "might, as politeness strategies. More importantly, Brown found that the management of conversation differed significantly between women's and men's groups. Women were careful to respect each other's turns, tended to apologise for talking too much, were concerned that everyone should participate, and disliked the domination of conversation by any one person. Men, by contrast, competed for dominance. Over time, they established a reasonably stable hierarchy with some men dominating conversation and others talking very little. Aries (1976) found that individual men frequently addressed the whole group, while individual women rarely do, preferring an interpersonal style involving one-to-one interaction.

Summarizing the research, we find general patterns. Women use questions more than men, and use them as part of a general strategy for conversational maintenance. Questions are speech acts which require a subsequent speech act--an answer, so using questions is a way of ensuring that a conversation continues. Men, use questions as simple requests for information and to

establish a group hierarchy. We have here a clash between direct and indirect modes--clearly an area with the potential for miscommunication.

We find in effect, the clashing of two cultures. Men and women have different styles and fail to appreciate the others' style because of differences in links, topic shifts, self-disclosure, aggressiveness, interruption, and listening (Coates, 1986). Women typically link their talk with what the previous speaker said; men are more likely to ignore it. In women's talk, self-disclosure is an opportunity for sharing experience; for men, self-disclosure is viewed as a request for advice. Women avoid verbal aggressiveness and view it as unpleasant interruption; for men, loud and aggressive argument is expected ritual display. When women interrupt, it is often with encouraging comment and active listening prods; men's interruptions are seen as attempts to seize a turn, and may ultimately silence the speaker. Women encourage others to speak; men compete for the role of speaker. Coates points out that these fundamental differences lead to miscommunication between men and women, resentment by women toward men, and men's denigration of women's ability to compete and speak up.

Explanations for Gender Difference

There are different interpretations of why these differences exist. According to Lakoff, women's language "submerges a woman's personal identity by denying her the means of expressing herself strongly, on the one hand, and encouraging expressions that suggest triviality in subject matter and uncertainty about it; and, when a woman is being discussed, by treating her as an object, sexual or otherwise but never a serious person with individual views." (p. 7-8). Because of their linguistic behavior, Lakoff states that women are systematically denied access to power and, ironically, made to feel that they deserve such treatment. Women have learned all too well, says Lakoff, to speak with apologies and to allow their own subordination.

Debate rages in recent literature among feminists concerning the implications of "women's language." Ayim (1984) explains, "Robin Lakoff's

claim that the frequency of tag questions in female speech signals uncertainty and lack of confidence is seen by Dale Spender as a sexist claim consistent with the broader social tendency to undervalue all things female." Spender (1980) shouts "sexism" in her indictment of the entire tradition of linguistic research. Social interpretations are deeply entrenched in the reporting of language "facts."

Ayim (1984) defends Lakoff's work, noting that her observations were based on personal impressions rather than statistical analyses. "The disadvantaged position of women relative to men in society does make it reasonable to assume that their language will be more tenuous and uncertain than that of men-that is, a priori, it seems a reasonable view that those in authority will speak with greater authority" (1984, p. 19). Ayim notes that women's tentative language indicates women's splendid survival skills for existence in a misogynist society. We see hesitancy in the tag questions of women and certitude in tag questions of men. Ayim continues: "analogously, one could see female tag questions as a direct request for response, support, or feedback from the listener. Such a measure would be an extremely sensible one when the listener was male, given the fairly extensive research on the lack of response of male listeners to female speakers. Male tag questions could be interpreted as an attempt to shape the beliefs of the listener, to pass off as more certain than it is a fairly dubious claim" (p. 19). In Ayim's analysis, since a patriarchal society lends greater credence to the views of males, male and female tag questions are not the same phenomena.

Another explanation is presented in Kramer's (1978) work. She recommends rethinking the conclusion that the female speech style is inferior to that of males and that women need to develop a more "neutral" (i.e. male) speech style in oder to become more competent communicators. Kramer's study revealed that many qualities attributed to women's speech concern for listener and good grammar could be considered positive, while many of the characteristics of male

speech appear to be negative, such as boastful and aggressive speech. "When Kramer (1978) compared attributes for an ideal speaker to those for stereotypical male and stereotypical female, she indeed found that more male characteristics deviated from the ideal than did female characteristics and concluded that stereotypic female speech includes characteristics which both women and men think desirable, at least in the abstract" (Scott, 1980, p. 200).

Preference for Female Language

Various studies show a valuing of women's speech. In Scott's (1980) study stereotypic characteristics assigned to women's language were rated more socially desirable than those associated with men's language. Female stereotypic traits, such as concern for listener, open, self revealing speech, and smiling were rated more desirable than male stereotypic traits, such as demanding voice, boastful speech, and excessive profanity. Refuting Lakoff's notion that male speech is seen as superior, Scott found that "not only were stereotypic female characteristics rated more positively than stereotypic male characteristics for effective communication among competent adults, but also the characteristics of effective females were more like those of effective adults than were those for effective males" (p. 207). However, men can get away with less desirable and competent language where they have more power. When women exhibit the language behavior rated more effective than that used by men, they may still be viewed as less effective because females are perceived as having less power and influence. But using a male stereotypic language pattern will seem unfenine and ineffective (Goodman, 1979).

Female Language as the Official, Elite, and Power Language

Jeske and Overman (1984) argue the logic of women's language as the more powerful, based on definitions of official language. As sociolinguist Max Adler (1978) notes, "in every language ... [it is] the top class which produces the standard speech" (p. 196). Its use signals status. According to Lanham (1981),

it is a formal style, "ritualized, formulaic, using a special vocabulary" (p. 56). One must learn it, if one expects to participate in areas of power. Official language is non-aggressive and correct. According to texts for executives which stress the importance of politeness, empathy, staying in the background, and focusing on the listener's needs, aggressive speech--using words that are superior, overly assertive, and belittling, affects listeners negatively and is therefore inappropriate (Thompson, 1980; Higginson, 1980).

Tentative delivery and phrasing are extremely important for managerial speech because it is more believable and more polite. Cannie (1978) shows that managers avoid unqualified statements and practice understating and qualifying phrases. Managers must reduce threat so they use non-threatening hedging questions. Also, "grammatical correctness is a absolute requirement in professional contexts...where clarity is essential, faulty grammar can lead to syntactic interference and hence confusion" (Jeske and Overman, 1984, p. 329).

Jeske and Overman conclude that women's language and the official language are nearly identical in terms of non-aggression. Although the traits of male speech, "aggressive," "loud," forceful," "demanding," "authoritarian," and "sexist"--may be valued in some speech situations, they are the opposite of what the prestige dialect requires. Women's language is tentative in stance and delivery, "demonstrating [women's] greater concern with internal psychological states" (Adler, 1978, p. 24). Women's language is correct. "The possibility of covert power accruing through non-standard forms notwithstanding, an individual, female or male, must demonstrate grammatical skill in order to be admitted into the power arena of, for example, a corporation. In this respect, women have the advantage" (Jeske and Overman, 1984, p. 332). Women's word stock connotes a sensitivity to nuance and the ability to describe fine shades of difference. Women's language is euphemistic and serious. Some women's language parallels official language, which leads to the remaining question: is official language the language of power?

The Berryman-Fink-Wilcox (1983) study shows that "female" language features consistently contribute to the communicator's credibility. "It can be concluded that rigid adherence to sex-based linguistic features is probably counterproductive in functional communication" (p. 667). The recommendation being made here advises communicators, regardless of their gender, to cultivate a repertoire of "situation-appropriate" and "goal-fulfilling" styles of communication. The key to effectiveness remains in the hand of the one who can adapt his or her language to the demands of the situation.

Sociolinguistic analysts have thus equated womens' language with the language of power, and have determined that powerless language is not just associated with women and with female language (Coates, 1980, O'Barr and Atkins, 1980). Ayim attests to the empowering aspects of women's speech, saying that

> "it is small wonder that males self-disclose to females more often that to other males. The prospect of expressing your innermost feelings and concerns to someone who has developed such linguistic habits as expressing little if any interest in what others are saying, making minimal efforts to even appear to be interested, and desiring to talk strictly about his own concerns is self-defeating from the outset. In women, on the other hand, the virtues of the good listener have been inculcated from early childhood, so it is natural that men would seek out women when they wish to talk about more intimate, personal aspects of their lives..." (p. 20). Women listen better, talk less, and learn from nuance, and from such self-disclosures obtain indirect access to power.

Managers and Female Language

Shakeshaft (1986) recommends that women retain women's language and that all managers--both male and female--could benefit from learning women's speech. Women's language produces a more participatory, consensual, and motivating management style. She identifies the need for managers to "engage in less autocratic downward communication and [to] develop noncoercive motivational and persuasive skills, humanized feedback, and threat-reducing strategies. Women's styles respond to this need very nicely" (p. 185).

Making connections between sociolinguistics and women in managerial positions, Shakeshaft (1987) acknowledges the literature on tag questions,

women's expressive language (e.g. "lovely," and "so"), and hedges. She also points out that "women shy away from universal pronouncements that would indicate that there is only one way of seeing things or that the way they understand the world is the only way" (p. 181). The language of women parallels the language of community building. It tends to be a more hospitable mode of discourse, demonstrating qualities such as courtesy, respect, and appreciation. Shakeshaft cites Kahn (1984) who notes women's use of more affiliation words than are used by men--the kind of words that connect rather than segmentalize people.

Shakeshaft cites Hyman's (1980) report that women more than men use language that indicates more consideration and concern. Baird and Bradley's (1979) study of communication styles of men and women in a hospital, a clerical department of a large manufacturing firm, and a production line of a small manufacturing firm, found that workers rated female managers higher in communication than male managers. Shakeshaft (1986) reported that this study "found that female managers gave the workers with whom they spoke more information, encouraged effort more, and stressed interpersonal relations through communication more than did males. Interestingly, male subordinates' job satisfaction and morale were lower when they worked under male, rather than female, managers" (p. 181).

Pearson states (cited in Shakeshaft, 1987) that "integrative decision-making and group problem-solving behaviors" (p. 64) represents another trend in communication for effective managers. Women's language, with its muting of argumentative intent, empathy, expressions of inclusion, listening, accuracy, and politeness, is much more in line with what is needed to facilitate participatory management.

Summary

Sociolinguistic research has produced evidence of some gender differences in language patterns, and also makes a case for affirming that women's language should be the language that induces participation, groupness, equality or shared leadership, accuracy, empathy, and sensitivity. Sociolinguistic research, however, does not empirically connect language patterns to real effects of language; it makes no connection between language and the question of efficacy in the real world. The next section proposes research agendas that not only identify patterns in the language of school administrators but also make connections between those patterns and their effects on the culture of schools.

Research Agendas: Linguistic Analysis of School Administration

The tools of anthropologists and linguists are powerful for pursuing questions about values, roles, social structure and function. This section generates research questions and methodologies for uncovering and critically examining the administrative culture through a focus on language and on gender differences.

The Sociolinguistic Questions

The sociolinguistic research tradition sets a pattern for research agendas on gender differences in school administration. Such new agendas require that we go beyond the typical subjects (college students) and generally contrived situations (questionaires and experimental small groups) found in much of the sociolinguistic research.

Questions about content patterns. In their daily work, do male and female school administrators differ along the dimensions studied by sociolinguists (e.g. tag questions, number of questions, hesitation, rising intonation, superpolite forms, female interest words, sense of humor, hypercorrect grammar, hedges, directives, etc.)? Do the language patterns of women educators change more than those of male educators when they become administrators? The latter

question addresses a way of understanding whether the administrative culture, at least in its language patterns, conflicts with women's ways of being.

Questions about conversational patterns. In their daily work, do male and female administrators differ according to their participation in conversation? For example, do men interrupt more? Seize turns more? What differences are there in verbal aggressiveness, threats, or name calling? How are questions used? Who dominates conversations? Who controls topic shifts?

Linking language patterns to perceived competence. Sociolinguists have tried to understand whether male/female language differences explain differences in power, appearance of competence, and leadership potential by asking people to rate hypothetical or experimental language behavior. This approach is limited, however. For research in school administration, we must look for indicators of real world judgments of on the job language patterns of administrators, find ways to describe their perceived competence, and then link the language and the competence issues together. Researchers can assess competence and leadership potential through observations and interviews looking for indicators of the following kinds of variables:

1. willingness to self-promote;
2. inclusion in formal and informal top echelon meetings;
3. higher percentage of tasks that are competency and visability enhancing;
4. ability to give rewards;
5. ability to mentor and sponsor as well as the obvious background variable such as formal credentials, access to resources, years on the job, etc. (Josephowitz, 1980; Kanter, 1977).

Field studies that combine interviewing, observation, and linguistic analysis will yield important insights that not only describe language patterns, but also the effects of those patterns on individuals' ability to project an image of competency and power upon which to build a career.

The Administrative culture Research Questions

If we view school administration as a professional culture and school districts and sites as cultures, then questions flow--questions about the ethos, the rituals, the functions of structures, and the interactions between them all. The roles associated with all of these questions initiates the flow of gender questions. Linguistic analysis of the content and the stories of school administrators will provide insights that go beyond tag questions and hedging issues. Analysis of content will enable us to describe the values of the culture of administration. Analysis of male and female language content will enable us to discover if there are gender differences in the basic values of administrators--whether or not the women actually speak in a different voice.

Politics, power, and control questions. Flowing from theories about leadership as exercise of power come research questions about the views in the administrative culture about power and politics and control.

What does the language reveal about administration's view of power and control? Is exhibiting power and control a necessary ability for school administrators? How do they learn about it? In what situations is the exercise of power essential? When is it non-functional according to the culture of administration? How do administrators use language to attain and maintain power and control?

Are there gender differences in the way power is learned, used, and expressed? When women use power and control expressions, are they perceived to be acting inappropriately? Do women purposefully avoid power language?

Decisionmaking. For school administrators, participatory decisionmaking is a public value, taught in formal classes and reiterated in speeches. However, an examination of administrators' language could provide insights into the norms and values that affect what happens in reality. What does their language reveal about administrators' attitudes and methods for managing participation? How do administrators come to value and acquire the skills for community involvement

and for teacher and student involvement? Finally, are there identifiable gender differences?

Values. Psychologist Carol Gilligan (1982) posited that women's moral development and decisionmaking differs from men's. Men make decisions based on justice and equality and rationality; women make decisions based on caring and the avoidance of violence. "While an ethic of justice proceeds from the premise of equality--that everyone should be treated the same--an ethic of care rests upon the premise on nonviolence--that no one should be hurt" (p. 174). According to Gilligan, women would be more "at risk in a society that rewards separation" (p. 156), since women's value and moral decisionmaking is based on caring and attachment.

Does the profession of school administration have established assumptions about the values premises of decisions? Do women administrators' values come into conflict with the administrative culture? Are women perceived as less competent when they cannot or will not make decisions on the same basis and with the same clarity and finality as men?

Conflict. Schools are arenas of conflict among classes, status, values, and resources. What does the language of administrators reveal about their styles for handling conflict? Does their language express a norm of avoidance, suppression, opportunity for building energy for creative problem solving? What language patterns do administrators use in conflict situations, e.g. angry groups, volatile basketball crowds, collective bargaining battles, or disruptive students? Are there gender differences?

Instructional leadership. Every school administrator must now proclaim him/herself to be an instructional leader. What are the language patterns used by people who are "established" instructional leaders? What language patterns are used to project high expectations, creative vision, and a safe and orderly environment? Are there gender differences?

Management of image. Leadership theory recognizes that, especially in

organizatiions with ambiguous, shifting goals, leaders must use symbols, rituals, and ceremonies to create a commonality of purpose and a vision that coheres and commits members to organizational goals. How do school administrators use language for these purposes and are there gender differences?

Why, in the era of affirmative action, when increasing numbers of women hold the appropriate credentials, do we see no increase in women occupying higher positions in education? Why, in the decade of "instructional leadership" are the educators with the greatest interest and expertise in instruction, (Gross and Trask, 1976); Hemphill et al. 1962) still excluded from the majority of administrative positions? When the dominant culture in research and practice in educational administration controls the questions asked, the research supported and published, and the policies implemented, it is time for those who research gender issues to demonstrate how women's voices and perspectives shed light on the dilemmas in the administration culture.

I propose a range of research agendas using linguistic analysis to understand the administrative culture, expecting this research to reveal norms and patterns in the culture (e.g. exaggerated emphasis on control, excluding people from participation in decisionmaking) and in the language patterns (e.g. prevalence of verbal aggressiveness, verbal interactions that silence others) that will provide the empirical grounding for a serious critique of that culture. That critique will, inevitably, include the voices of women educators. It will also inevitably, point to the need to expand our theory of leadership to incorporate the values, experiences and styles of women. A human model of leadership, a facilitating, inclusionary, respecting, sensitive model would emerge from the analysis of the language of women educators. I believe that the re-formation of school leadership must rest on such a model. In this reform, we must strenuously reject the push to change women to adopt the male style. Women's voices will be the data base for the critique. The critique of and the reformulation of the administrative culture should be from a woman's voice.

REFERENCES

Adler, M. (1978). Sex differences in human speech: A socio-linguistic study. Hamburg: Buske.

Aries, E. (1976). Interaction patterns and themes of male, female, and mixed groups. Small Group Behavior. 7, 7-18.

Austin, B. & Brown, L. Jr. (1970). Report of the Assistant Principalship of the Study of the Secondary School Principalship. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Ayim, M. (1984). Conflict and interaction in language: A study of male and female speech patterns. Resources for Feminist Research, 13(3), 19-20.

Baird, J. E. & Bradley, P. H. (1979). Styles of management and communication: A comparative study of men and women. Communication Monographs, 46(2), 101-111.

Berman, J. (1982, March). The managerial behavior of female high school principals: Implications for training. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Bernard, J. (1972). The sex game. New York: Atheneum.

Berryman-Fink, C. L., & Wilcox, J. R. (1983). A multivariate investigation of perceptual attributions concerning gender appropriateness in language. Sex Roles, 9(6), 663-681.

Brown, P. (1980). How and why are women more polite: Some evidence from a Mayan community. In McConnell-Ginet, S. et al. (Eds.), Women and language literature and society, (pp. 111-136) New York: Praeger.

Cannie, J. (1978). The women's guide to management success: How to win power in the real organizational world. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Coates, J. (1986). Women, men, and language: A sociolinguistic account of sex differences in language. New York: Longman.

Dubois, B. L., & Crouch, I. (1975). The question of tag questions in women's speech: They don't really use more of them, do they? Language in Society, 4, 289-94.

Eakins, B. W., & Eakins, R. G. (1978). Sex differences in human communication. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Fishel, A. & Pottker, J. (1977). Performance of women principals: A review of behavioral and attitudinal studies. In J. Pottker & A. Fishel (Eds.), Sex bias in the schools (pp. 289-299). Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Press.

Fishmann, P. (1980). Conversational insecurity. In Giles, Robinson, & Smith (Eds.), Language: Social psychological perspectives (pp. 127-132). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Gaertner, K. N. (1981). Administrative careers in public school organizations. In P. A. Schmuck, W. W. Charters, Jr. & R. O. Carlson (Eds.), Educational

policy and management; sex differentials (pp. 199-217). New York: Academic Press.

Gillian, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goodman, E.J. (1976). Women, money & power. New York: William Morrow.

Gomm, I. (1981). A study of the inferior image of the female use of the English language as compared to that of the male. Unpublished B. A. dissertation, Edge Hill College, Ormskirk.

Gronn, P. (1983). Talk as the work: The accomplishment of school administration. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 1-21.

Gross, N., & Trask, A. E. (1976). The sex factor and the management of schools. New York: John Wiley.

Gross, N., & Trask, A. E. (1964). Men and women's elementary school principals (Final Report No. 2). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Graduate School of Education.

Haas, A. (1979). Male and female spoken language differences: Stereotypes and evidence. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 616-26.

Haven, E., Adkinson, P. & Bagley, M. (1980). Minorities in educational administration: The principalship. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Hemphill, John K.; Griffiths, D. E.; and Frederickson, N. (1962). Administrative performance and personality: A study of the principal in a simulated elementary school. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Higginson, M. (1980). The ambitious woman's guide to a successful career. New York: Amacom.

Hirschmann, L. (1974, July). Analysis of supportive and assertive behaviour in conversations. Paper presented at Linguistic Society of American meeting.

Holmes, J. (1984). Hedging your bets and sitting on the fence: Some evidence for hedges as support structures. Te Reo, 27, 47-62.

Hyman, B. (1980). Responsive leadership: The women manager's asset or liability? Supervisory Management, 25(8), 40-43.

Jeske, J. M. & Overman, K. (1984). Gender and the official language. International Journal of women's studies. 1, 322-335.

Josefowitz, N. (1980). Paths to power: A woman's guide from first job to top executive. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley

Kahn, L. S. (1984). Group process and sex difference. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 8(3), 261-281.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers

Kmetz, J. T., & Willower, D. J. (1982). Elementary school principals' work behavior. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(4), 62-78.

Kramer, C. (1975). Women and men's perception of female and male speech. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Champain, IL.

Kramer, C. (1978). Women's and men's ratings of their own ideal speech. Communciation Quarterly, 26, 2-11.

Lakoff, R. (1975). Language and women's place. New York: Harper & Row.

Lanham, R. (1981). Revising business prose. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Leet-Pellegrini, H. M. (1980). Conversational dominance as a function of gender and expertise. In Giles, Robinson & Smith (Eds.), Language: Social psychological perspectives (pp. 97-104). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Marshall, C. (1979). Career socialization of women in school administration. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83(2), 340-362.

Mintzberg, H. (1973). The nature of managerial work. New York: Harper & Row.

Mitchell, B. A. (1987). Modes for managing the assistant principalship: Sex differences in socialization, role orientation and mobility of public secondary school assistant principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.

O'Barr, W., & Atkins, B. (1980). 'Women's language' or 'powerless language'?. pp. 93-110 In McConnell-Ginet et al. (Eds.), Women and language in literature and Society (pp. 93-110). New York: Praeger.

Ortiz, F. I. (1982). Career patterns in education: Women, men, and minorities in school administration. New York: Praeger.

Pfeffer, J. (1981). Management as symbolic action. In L. L. Cummings, & B. m. Staw (Eds.), Vol. 3: Research in organizational behavior (pp. 1-52). JAL Press.

Pharis, W. L. & Zachariya, S. B. (1979). The elementary school principalship in 1978: A research study. Arlington, VA: National Association of Elementary Principals.

Philips, S. U. (1980). Sex differences and language. Annual Review of Anthropology, 9, 523-544.

Pitner, N. (1981). Hormones and harems: Are the activities of superintending different for a woman? In P. Schmuck, W. W., Charters, Jr. and Carlson, R. (Eds.). Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials. New York: Academic Press.

Pondy, L. (1978). Leadership is a language game. In M. McCall & M. Lombardo

(Eds.), Leadership: Where else can we go? (pp.87-89). Durham: Duke Press.

Scott, K. P. (1980). Perceptions of communication Competence: What's good for the goose is not good for the gander. Women's Studies International Quarterly, 3, 199-208.

Shakeshaft, C. (1986). A female organizational culture. Educational Horizons, 64(3), 117-122.

Shakeshaft, C. (1987). Women in educational administration. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Spender, D. (1980). Man made language. London, Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Stone, M. (1983, April 19). Learning to say it in cup of tea language. The Guardian (Women's Page).

Strodtbeck, F., & Mann, R. (1956). Sex role of differentiation in jury deliberations. Sociometry, 19, 3-11.

Thompson, A. (1980). Management strategies for women. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Timpano, D. M. & Knight, L. W. (1976). Sex discrimination in the selection of school district administrators: What can be done? Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Williams, R. H., & Willower, D. J. (1983, April). Female school superintendents' perceptions of their work. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Wolcott, H. (1973). The man in the principals office: An ethography. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Zimmerman, D., & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. pp. 105-29. In Thorne, B. & Henley, N. (Eds.), Language and sex: Difference and dominance (pp. 105-129). Rowley, MA.: Newbury House.